



**AGENDA FOR REGULAR MEETING OF THE
PROBATION OVERSIGHT COMMISSION WORKING GROUP
KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET, ROOM 140
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012**

Monday, April 11, 2016

9:00 AM

Call to Order

Chair Chodroff called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m.

Present: Chair Carol Chodroff, Vice Chair Alex Johnson, Gabriella Holt,
Don Meredith (Arrived at 9:16) and Jose Osuna

I. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Approval of Minutes for the Meeting of March 10, 2016. (16-1756)

On motion of Member Holt, seconded by Vice Chair Johnson, unanimously carried (Member Meredith being absent), the Probation Oversight Commission Working Group approved the March 10, 2016 Minutes.

Attachments: [Draft Minutes for 03-10-16](#)

II. REPORTS

2. Report by the Chief Executive Office on the process for selecting a Consultant, to include a review of potential consultants and summary of their previous work performance. (16-1758)

Dardy Chen, Chief Executive Office, presented the Working Group with a list of potential consultants for Probation Governance Best Practices. Mr. Chen informed the Working Group that the Chief Executive Office intends to disseminate a Statement of Work to each vendor in order to determine which consultants are best suited to the tasks of the Probation Oversight Commission Working Group. Mr. Chen informed the Working Group that the list was developed from an existing Master List of Agreements from the Chief Executive Office (CEO), the Countywide Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee, Board Offices, and suggestions from the Probation Oversight Commission Working Group Members. Mr. Chen indicated that a Statement of Work (SOW) has been developed and sent

to the Board Offices for review. Upon Board Office approval, an email will be sent to each vendor to solicit a SOW to assist the Working Group with a selection of a consultant. The time allotted for the vendor's response and submission of their SOW to the CEO's office is three weeks. The CEO will analyze the responses and prepare a vetted list of potential consultants for the Working Group's consideration. The total process will take approximately two months, and discussion ensued. During discussion, the Working Group asked that the report be a recurring item on future agendas.

On motion of Member Holt, seconded by Vice Chair Johnson, unanimously carried (Member Meredith being absent), the Probation Oversight Commission Working Group Received and Filed the Chief Executive Office's Report.

Attachments: [CEO Report](#)

3. Report by Chief Executive Office on meeting dates and locations for possible Town Hall meetings. (16-1760)

Dardy Chen, Chief Executive Office, presented a verbal report to the Working Group. Mr. Chen informed the Working Group that Town Hall meetings are usually set after the Working Group has had the opportunity to prepare a Working Draft Report to the Board of Supervisors and prior to its submittal to the Board. Mr. Chen indicated that there will be at least one meeting in each Supervisorial District.

Chair Chodroff inquired if there would be interpreters at the meetings. The Working Group was informed that there would be two interpreters at each meeting along with translation devices available for the public.

On motion of Member Holt, seconded by Vice Chair Johnson, unanimously carried, the Probation Oversight Commission Working Group Received and Filed the Chief Executive Office's Report.

Attachments: [CEO Report](#)

4. Report by the Interim Chief Probation Officer regarding juvenile field placements. (16-1761)

Cal Remington, Interim Chief Probation Officer, presented an analysis of the Los Angeles County Probation Department's Field Services Population. Mr. Remington informed the Working Group that the juvenile population has been significantly reduced in the past five years, as well as the populations in the juvenile institutions. Currently there are less than 1300 juveniles in custody, which is a significant and welcomed trend. Mr. Remington highlighted other various aspects of the analysis.

Chair Chodroff requested clarification on the term "Active Investigation." Mr. Remington indicated that the Active Investigation is reflective of various elements and entities working together to develop an appropriate program for each juvenile, including social, educational and family needs. This would be pre-adjudication.

Chair Chodroff further inquired if California Welfare and Institutions Code Section 236 juveniles are supervised in school settings along with juveniles in formal probation. Mr. Remington will clarify and report back to the Working Group.

Attachments: [Probation Department Report](#)

5. Review of existing Commissions, Committees and Agencies for the Working Group's consideration and a summary of their roles and tasks relative to Probation Department and the Working Group, as presented by the Interim Chief Probation Officer. (16-1762)

Cal Remington, Interim Chief Probation Officer, presented a matrix of existing commission, committees and agencies to the Working Group along with a summary of their roles and responsibilities. Member Holt inquired if there is an oversight body for the Title IV-E Waiver. Mr. Remington indicated that there is not an official oversight body, however, there is federal oversight and audits are performed. Member Holt inquired if there is oversight for the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act. Mr. Remington indicated that the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC) oversees the JJCPA. Mr. Remington indicated that the JJCC will be added to the matrix.

Member Holt informed the Working Group that under the direction of the Board of Supervisors a Comprehensive Education Reform Committee was formed which includes the Department of Probation, the Los Angeles County Office of Education, the Departments of Mental and Public Health and the County Librarian. Member Holt inquired if the Committee is still meeting as it may serve as an important component to the evaluation work of the Probation Oversight Commission. Mr. Remington indicated the Committee meets quarterly and that the Committee will be added to the matrix for future consideration by the Working Group.

Member Holt requested that the Probation Commission be added to the schedule of agencies that will be making presentations to the Working Group, and also requested that this matter be made a recurring item on future agendas, and discussion ensued.

After discussion, on motion of Member Meredith, seconded by Member Holt, unanimously carried, the Probation Oversight Commission Working Group Received and Filed the Interim Chief Probation Officer's Report.

Attachments: [Probation Department Report](#)

III. DISCUSSION

6. Discussion regarding the relationship between, and potential consolidation of: 1) the Oversight Commission Consultant's Evaluation to explore and recommend the best practices model of the Probation Department; and 2) the Evaluation of the Probation Department's Juvenile Justice and Crime Prevention Act Program. (16-1918)

Chair Chodroff requested the Interim Chief Probation Officer (Interim CPO) present an overview of the relationship between the Oversight Commission Consultant's Evaluation and the Evaluation of the Probation Department's Juvenile Justice and Crime Prevention Act Program. Cal Remington, Interim CPO, presented background information regarding the formation of the Juvenile Justice and Crime Prevention Act Program. Mr. Remington indicated that after careful analysis, it was determined that the two Evaluations should continue on two separate tracks, however, come together in a final analysis. Mr. Remington indicated that there are financial considerations as to how each Evaluation will be funded, and discussion ensued. During discussion, Adrienne Byers, County Counsel answered questions posed by the Working Group. Chair Chodroff requested that the matter be made a recurring discussion item on future

agendas. Vice Chair Johnson inquired as to the timeline for the Evaluation Study from the Juvenile Justice and Crime Prevention Act Program. Mr. Remington indicated that the Department will take a look at the Master Agreement list for potential consultants to assist with the Evaluation. However, the Report will most likely be completed at the same time the Working Group's Report is concluded. Vice Chair inquired as to the authority for the formation of the Juvenile Justice and Coordinating Council. Mr. Remington informed that the Council was authorized under State Legislation, and discussion ensued, after which Chair Chodroff closed the discussion item.

IV. MISCELLANEOUS

7. Matters not on the posted agenda, to be discussed and (if requested) referred to staff or placed on the agenda for action at a future meeting, or matters requiring immediate action because of an emergency situation or where the need to take action came to the attention of the Working Group subsequent to the posting of the agenda. (16-1774)

Vice Chair Johnson requested that the Working Group begin to develop a systematic approach as to how each agency will provide a report to the Working Group, verbal and written, for the purpose of evaluation by the Working Group, and discussion ensued as to which agencies could be most readily available to present a report before the Working Group.

Commission Staff indicated that they will work with Working Group Members and the various departments and agencies in scheduling future presentations.

Opportunity for members of the public to address the Working Group on items of interest that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Working Group.
(16-1775)

There were none.

8. Adjournment for the Regular Meeting of Monday, April 11 2016. (16-1776)

Chair Chodroff adjourned the meeting at 9:57 a.m.